

REMARKS

The office action of September 7, 2005 allowed claims 1-4 and found allowability of several other claims that depended from unallowed claims. From these, allowable claim 14 has been added to claim 11 (with some minor clarifying changes), allowable claim 18 has been added to claim 16, and allowable claim 27 has been added to claim 23. These changes effectively add claims 11-13, 15-17, 19, and 23-26 to the allowed list. These changes also result in cancellation of claims 14, 18, and 27.

This leaves only claims 5-10 and 20-22 as subject to rejections made in the office action. All of these claims have been amended to clarify distinctions from the cited art.

Each of the cited references, Steffee and Jones, use arrangements of bungee cords that can be pinned to a moving element in different groups to afford different resistances to movement of the element. A carrier for each elastic cord that is to provide resistance to the movement must be pinned to the moving element so that multiple cord resistances requires multiple pinnings of cord brackets to the moving element. Maximum resistance requires a pin to be inserted through a maximum number of cord brackets, which requires that the pin be long and be freely insertable through a large number of well-aligned holes to make the necessary connections.

In contrast to this, claims 5 and 20 define a variable resistance method and assembly that requires connection of only a single link to a moving rod to determine the selectable number of resistances deployed. Whether all the available resistances to movement are to be used, or only a minimum number of resistances to movement, the result in each case is determined by pinning a single selected link to the movable rod. This can be done with a shorter pin that can conveniently and unerringly pin any one of the selectable links to the moving rod, without having to extend the pin through a number of aligned holes in separate brackets all of which become attached to the rod.


This system works, as defined in claims 5 and 20, because of the way the links are arranged around the rod and spaced along the rod so that any selected link pinned to the rod determines which links will move with the rod and which links will not move with the rod. The

prior art does not suggest any similar way of determining between fixed and movable spring resistances merely by selecting a single link to be pinned to a rod.

The prior art thus suggests that any elastic element to resist a movement must be itself connected to the moving element, whereas the claimed method and arrangement distinguishes between the fixed and movable resistance elements merely by connecting a single selected one of the elements to the rod. The cited art therefore lacks elements of the claims as amended, all of which appear to be allowable over the cited references so that the previous rejections can be withdrawn. For any question on this, the examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney.

Recognizing that Internet communications are not secured, I hereby authorize the PTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail. I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file.

Respectfully Submitted:
Yong Woo Kim

By: 
Eugene Stephens, Registration No.: 20,649
Attorney for Applicant

BROWN & MICHAELS, P.C.
400 M&T Bank Building - 118 N. Tioga St.
Ithaca, NY 14850
(607) 256-2000 • (607) 256-3628 (fax)
e-mail: bpm@bpmlegal.com
Dated: November 16, 2005